DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 447 SP 035 842

AUTHOR Leslie, Carl E.
TITLE A Descriptive and Comparative Study of the Student Teaching Programs in the North Central Region.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (75th, Detroit, MI, February 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); Change Strategies; Comparative Analysis; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Preservice Teacher Education; Private Colleges; Program Implementation; Public Colleges; Schools of Education; Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Education Programs; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educ; North Central Association of Colleges and Schools; *United States (North Central)

ABSTRACT

This study examined and compared undergraduate student teaching programs in the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools' accreditation region of state-approved institutions of higher education. A survey of 162 (72%) directors of student teaching programs addressed four areas: general background of the institutions, administration of the student teaching programs, student teachers themselves, and cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers. Findings within these four areas are presented, and data are compared between private and public institutions and between National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and non-NCATE institutions. The study concluded that institutional size contributed to many of the differences among institutions in the region. There was diversity in the number of student teacher visits made by the college supervisor. There were some institutions that did not allow students who were unsuccessful at student teaching to be given a second chance to be successful. Recommendations from survey respondents are presented, such as developing more effective ways of selecting cooperating teachers, developing more training in clinical supervision for cooperating teachers, making student teaching a full semester in length, and recognizing cooperating teachers and principals for service performed. (Contains 20 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Descriptive and Comparative Study of the Student Teaching Programs in the North Central Region

A presentation by

Carl E. Leslie

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
Carbondale, IL

Association of Teacher Educators

75th Annual Meeting
Detroit, MI
February 18-22, 1995

ED 380 447

SP035842

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. E. Leslie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Descriptive and Comparative Study of the Student Teaching Programs in the North Central Region

Introduction

It is unfortunate but colleges's and universities's programs in the North Central Region that prepare teachers and other educators for the schools of our nations children have not changed as quickly as necessary. "The professional teacher preparation curriculum has remained essentially the same for more than 50 years" (Tom, 1991). Courses are offered in educational psychology, foundations and the history and philosophy of education followed by methods courses, and by practice or student teaching. Over the years there have been a number of reports proposing teacher education reform. Included among such calls for teacher education reform reports are A Call for Change in Teacher Education by the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education; Improving Teacher Education: An Agenda for Higher Education and the Schools by the Southern Regional Education Board; the California Commission on the Teaching Profession's Who Will Teach Our Children? and so on. Of course the three most widely discussed reform reports are National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education's (NCATE) Redesign; the Holmes Group's, Tomorrow's Teachers; and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession's, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.

According to the Renaissance Group:

> Teachers for the future must have in-depth knowledge of subject-matter. They must be skilled at constructing and using metaphors that are appropriate to understanding that subject-matter. They must understand the structure of knowledge of the disciplines they will be teaching and the inter-relationship of knowledge from various disciplines.

> They also must demonstrate an understanding that problem-solving requires application and knowledge from many disciplines. These teachers also must know how to teach. They must be adept at managing classrooms. They must understand sequencing of learning experiences and be able to match their teaching with the experiences and cultural background of their students...(p. 2).

It is believed that teacher education programs must teach students that education is a social system and how the school links to other community agencies. Our schools must offer our children a sense of fulfillment and ultimately, encourage them to become responsible citizens and workers thus capable leader in the 21st century. A new commitment to the children of our society needs to be reaffirmed by the colleges and universities to improve teacher education thereby, improving schools. Teacher education must be interested in making great achievements in the improvement of our nation's quality of education as a university-wide responsibility and institutional commitment.

There seems to be an on-going debate over how best to improve and/or reform our nation's schools; thus, the quality of teachers remains a critical issue. "Since the publication of "A Nation at Risk" (1983), policy makers and other have decried the poor quality of the individuals drawn to teaching (Schlecty & Vance, 1983) and the poor quality of the teacher-education programs that prepared them (Sykes, 1983). During the 1980's there were several standpoints of educational reform.

Statement of the Purpose

During this time of turbulence and strict appraisal of teacher education programs throughout the country, concerns about the performance of tomorrow's teachers have abounded (Roth, 1984-85). Calhoun (1986) stated, however, that "one of the best indicators of how tomorrow's teachers will perform is the preparation they are receiving today" (p. 178). Such preparation does not just happen; it is "shaped . . . by the decisions made by today's educators. Professional educators themselves will create the future of clinical experiences by what they do and fail to do about the realities and trends of our times" (Abrell, 1982, p. 284).

The student teaching experience can be the most valuable aspect of a teacher education program but "is probably the most maligned element of our programs. Complaints center around the credibility and consistency with which programs are planned and implemented" (Yerg, 1982, p. 69).

According to Roth, (1984-85) the future of teacher education will be determined largely by the practices occurring today. The purpose of this study was to examine and to compare current undergraduate student teaching programs in the NCACS' accreditation region of state approved institutions of higher education. Through this investigation, the consistency and variance among the programs throughout the region can be determined.

Research Design/Method

The classical descriptive research design was used in this study. This design involved a survey of related literature, revising a 1981 questionnaire, and randomly selecting 227 institutions in the region and mailing them questionnaires. The purpose of the study was to examine and to compare the undergraduate student teaching programs in the NCACS accreditation region's state approved institutions of higher education. As a result of the examination of the likenesses and differences existing among the student teaching programs, a profile was developed of the most common practices occurring in the region's student teaching programs. In addition, obvious differences existing between the public and private student teaching programs can be determined. Also, differences can be ascertained between programs accredited by NCATE and those that are not nationally accredited. The student teaching programs were then compared to the Johnson and Yates 24 criteria established determine the best student teaching programs. Directors of the student teaching programs were expected to provide recommendations for future improvements in the student teaching programs throughout the region.

Paragraphs below contains the method used in this study. This information is presented in the following section: (a) research questions, (b) description of the population, (c) instrument, (d) method of data gathering, and (e) treatment of data.

Research Questions:

There were five research questions for this study, which were as follows:

1) What is the status of selected variables regarding the administration of student teaching programs, within the NCACS region:

a. administrative personnel;

b. supervision procedures and personnel;

c. selection of student teachers;

d. placement of student teachers?

2) What is the status of selected variables regarding student teachers within the NCACS region:

a. number of student teachers;

b. assessment of student teachers?

3) What is the status of selected variables regarding cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers:

a. written contracts with school districts;

b. characteristics of cooperating teachers;

c. training of cooperating teachers;

d. remuneration of cooperating teachers?

4) Are there differences in selected variables between programs that are accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and those programs that are not accredited?

5) Are there differences in selective variables between programs from private and public institutions of higher education in the NCACS region?

Description of the Population

The population of this study was limited to the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation region's state approved institutions of higher education offering undergraduate teacher education programs. This region includes institutions of higher education from the following states: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. At the time of this study, 18 of these 19 states had at least one institution with a degree granting undergraduate teacher education program.

A listing of the public and private colleges and universities with teacher education programs and the names and addresses of the directors of student teaching programs were obtained from the State Departments of Instruction. A random sample of 227 then was drawn from the total 442 institutions with teacher education programs by the researcher. In order to randomize the 442 institutions a card with the name of each institution was put in an envelope then drawn out one at a time until the 227 institutions had been selected.

Instrument

"A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs," developed by Johnson and Yates (1981), was revised and used as the questionnaire in the study. The questionnaire was submitted to the researcher's Doctoral Committee and to the director of student teaching at a large midwestern university for revisions.

The questionnaire consists of the following four sections: (a) general background of the institutions, (b) administration of the student teaching programs,(c) student teachers themselves, and (d) cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers. A letter explaining the purpose of the study accompanied the questionnaires.

Method of Data Gathering

A copy of the modified instrument with a letter of explanation and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was mailed in the fall of 1994, to the directors of the student teaching programs in the NCACS accreditation region's state approved institutions of higher education. The directors were asked to return the completed survey not more than thirty days later.

As of sixty days later, 67% or 108 of the total questionnaires mailed had been returned. A follow-up letter and second questionnaire was mailed in October to the directors who had not responded. An additional 54 questionnaires were received as a result of the follow-up. As of late fall, 1994, the cut-off date to accept questionnaires, the total number of questionnaires received was 162. This number represented 72% of the institutions surveyed that returned questionnaires.

Treatment of Data

In order to construct a profile of the practices most often occurring in the student teaching programs, the data collected from the questionnaires were analyzed using the SAS, IBM statistical package program. The data received from the questionnaires were

presented descriptively using percentages and means. The chi-square test was ran on categorical data and there were significant dependents found between NCATE and non-NCATE and private and public school programs in the region. Chi-square indicated that probability was less than .05 level of significance, the dependence between NCATE and non-NCATE type schools and the respective categorical variable is statistically significant. Like NCATE and non-NCATE type schools, when chi-square indicated that probability was less than .05 level of significance, the dependence between private and public type schools and the respective categorical variable is statistically significant.

Using t test additional significance were found. The t test was ran on the continuous or numerical variables/data. The T Test test the significance of the difference between the population means for NCATE/non-NCATE and private/public schools, respectively, on all numerical variables under the study. When the probability value is less than .05, we have sufficient evidences, at level of significance .05, to say that the two population means are different.

Finally, we analyzed graphically the frequenceis of the number variables over the four possible combinations from NCATE/non-NCATE and private/public in relation to the research questions.

Definition of Variables

GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE INSTITUTION

1. SCHLTYPE-Is your school a public or private institution?
   - 1 Private
   - 2 Public
2. NUMSTUDS-Approximately how many full-time undergraduate students are enrolled at you institution?
3. NUMPREP-Approximately how many students are enrolled in your teacher preparation programs?
4. NCACS-Is your program accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS)?
   - 0 No
   - 1 Yes
   - 2 Other, please state association
5. NCATE-Is your program accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)?
   - 1 Yes
   - 0 No
6. ADMITTED-When are students admitted to your teacher education program?
   - 1 Freshman
   - 2 Sophomore
   - 3 Junior
   - 4 Senior

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

7. INCHARGE-What is the title of the person who is directly in charge of your total student teaching program?
   - 1 Director of Clinical Experiences
   - 2 Head, Department of Education
   - 3 Dean, College of Education
   - 4 Director of Student Teaching
   - 5 Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences
   - 6 Coordinator Professional Education Experiences
   - 7 Other, please state title

8. YRCHRGE-How many years have you been in charge of the student teaching program?

1 Less than 1 year
2 1- 2 years
3 3- 4 years
4 5-10 years
5 11-15 years
6 16-20 years
7 More than 20 years

9. OTHHELP-Do you have other members of the institution's academic staff (as opposed to clerical) to assist you in the administration and organization of the student teaching program?

10a. TITLES-Titles, if any, of the staff:

1 Director of Clinical Experiences
2 Head, Department of Education
3 Dean, College of Education
4 Director of Student Teaching
5 Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences
6 Coordinator Professional Education Experiences
7 Other

10b. What other support personnel do you have working on the administration and organization of student teaching programs?

SECTARY-Secretaries

ADMNSTAF-Administrative Assistants

GRADASS-Graduate Assistants

10c. ADEQUATE-Do you feel that this number is adequate?

1 Yes
0 No

11. PRCNTADM-As the person in charge of student teaching, approximately what percent of your total time is actually devoted to administering the student teaching program (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching a class, other administrative duties, etc.)?

1 1 - 10%
2 11 - 25%
3 26 - 50%
4 51 - 75%
5 76 - 90%
6 91 - 100%

12. CAMPLAB-Does your institution have a campus laboratory school?

1 Yes
0 No

13. PLACETYP-In what type of school do you place you student teachers?

1 Public schools only
2 Private schools only
3 Both public and private schools
4 Campus laboratory schools only
5 Other, please explain

14. RESPONS-Who has primary responsibility for assigning student teachers to schools?

1 Student teaching office
2 Academic major department
3 College supervisors
4 Staff from cooperating schools
5 Other, please state

15. DECISION-Who makes the final decision as to whether a student teacher should pass or fail student teaching?

1 Director of student teaching
2 College supervisors
3 Cooperating teacher
4 Department Head of Student Program
5 Other, please state

16. Please check those items which you include as requirements for admission to teacher education/student teaching.

ACADREC-Overall academic record
EDUCCRSE-Record in professional education courses
MAJOR-Record in major field
ENGLISH-English proficiency
SPEECH-Speech and voice
HEARING-Hearing
PHYSED-Physical fitness
ADVISOR-Recommendation by advisor
EMOTION-motional stability
PERSONAL-Personal-social-ethical fitness
EXTEA-Extra-class activity
OTHER-Other, please state

17. DENIED-Of the students who formally apply for teacher education/student teaching, approximately what percent of the applicants are denied admission to student teaching?

0 All applicants are admitted
1 Less than 1% are denied admission
2 1 - 2% are denied admission
3 3 - 4% are denied admission
4 5 - 6% are denied admission
5 7 - 8% are denied admission
6 9 - 10% are denied admission
7 More than 10% are denied admission

18. Please fill in the following showing the number of college supervisors that you have.

College Supervisors

NUMELEM-Elementary

NUMSECON-Secondary

NUMSPED-Special Ed.

NUMGENRL-Generalist (K-12)

NUMTOTAT-Total

19a. EMPGRAD-Do you employ graduate students to supervise student teachers?

1 Yes
0 No

19b. PCNTGRAD-If "yes", approximately what percentage of your total student teaching supervision is done by graduate students rather than by regular faculty members?

20. AVENUM-What is the average number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor (or the equivalent of a full-time college supervisor if you have part-time college supervisors) at any one time?

0 1 - 5
1 6 - 10
2 11 - 15
3 16 - 20
4 21 - 25
5 26 - 30
6 31 - 35
7 36 - 40
8 More than 40

21. PATTERN-Please check the statement which best describes the general pattern of your college supervisor's visits to each student teacher.

1 Twice each week
2 Once each week
3 Once every two weeks
4 Once every three weeks
5 Once every month
6 Other

22. AVETIME-What is the average amount of time that a supervisor will spend per visit with each student teacher?

1 30 minutes
2 45 minutes
3 60 minutes
4 75 minutes
5 90 minutes
6 Other, please state

STUDENT TEACHERS

---

23. STUTEACH-How many student teachers did your institution have during the academic year 1993-94, not including the summer session.

0 Under 25
1 25 - 49
2 50 - 99
3 100 - 149
4 150 - 199
5 200 - 249
6 250 - 299
7 300 - 349
8 350 or more

24. GRADETYE-What type of grade do you use for student teaching?

1 Letter grade (A, B, C, etc.)
2 Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
3 Pass/Fail
4 Other, please specify

25. WHOEVAL-Check those who participate in the evaluation of student teachers (Cooperating teacher).

1 Yes
0 No

26. CULTURE-Do you provide opportunities for student teaching in culturally diverse areas?

1 Yes
0 No

27. OVERONE-Do you place more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time?

1 Never
2 25% or less
3 26 - 75%
4 76 - 100%

28a. PRETEACH-Do most of your students have pre-student teaching experiences.

1 Yes
0 No

28b. TOTHRS-If "yes", how many total hours

29. UNSUCCES-Approximately what percent of your student teachers are unsuccessful in their first student teaching assignment?

0 None
1 Less than 1%
2 1%
3 2%
4 3%
5 4%
6 5%
7 6%
8 over 6%

30. ALTRNTIV-What alternatives are available to a student who is unsuccessful in his or her first student teaching assignment?

1 The student is eliminated from the teacher education program once and for all.
2 The student is given a second student teaching assignment after meeting certain requirements.
3 The student may appeal to a committee which determines if her/she may have a second student teaching assignment.
4 Other, please explain

31. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) according to frequency the following causes of student teacher difficulty at your institution.

CONTROL-Inability to control students
GETALONG-Inability to get along with the cooperating teacher
ORGANIZ-Poor sense of organization
SUBJMAT-Poor subject matter background
METHOD-Poor knowledge of teaching methodology
OTHRANK-Other, please state

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

---

32. CONTRACT-Do you have written contracts with the schools in which you place student teachers?

1 Yes
0 No

33. NUMCOOP-What was the approximate total number of cooperating teachers with whom you placed student teachers during the past school year (1993-94)?

0 Under 25
1 26 - 50
2 51 - 100
3 101 - 150
4 151 - 200
5 201 - 250
6 250 - 300
7 301 - 350
8 351 or more

34. Check any of the following techniques that you use to help train cooperating student:

FORMCRSE-Offering a formal course in the supervision of student teaching
WRKSHOP-Holding workshops for cooperating teachers
SEMINAR-Conducting small seminars with cooperating teachers
CONFERNC-Holding larger conferences on student teaching
NEWSLETT-Mailing student teaching newsletters to cooperating teachers
STATECON-Sending cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching
NATLCON-Sending cooperating teachers to national conferences dealing with student teaching
OTHTECH-Other, place state

35. Please check those characteristics that you look for in a cooperating teacher:

SMATTER-Subject matter competency
TCHMETH-Knowledge of teaching methodology
HUMREL-Human relations skills
BS-Possession of a bachelor's degree and teaching qualification
MS-Possession of a master's degree
WILLING-Willingness to work with student teachers
SUPCRSE-Having taken a courses in Supervision of Student Teaching
POSSESS-Possession of a certificate for this type of work
OTHCHAR-Other, please state

36. DESCIBES-Check the statement which base describes your policy concerning payment to cooperating teachers and/or cooperating school systems for working with your student teachers.

1 We do not pay for this service
2 We make a payment to the school system
3 We make a payment directly to the cooperating teacher
4 Other, please explain

37a. PAYTEACH-What, if any, is the total amount that you pay the cooperating teacher per student teacher?

37b. TUITWAIV-Tuition waiver hour

38. Please check any of those benefits which you provide for your cooperating teachers.

FACSTAT-Some type of college faculty status
FREETUIT-Free tuition for college courses
LIBRARY-Library privileges
LISTNAME-List name in the college catalog
FREECONS-Free consultant services from the college
ATHPASS-Passes to athletic events
CONCPASS-Passes to concerts
NONE-None
OTHBEN-Other, please explain

39a. PAYMENT-Do building principals receive payments for the placement of student teachers in their building?

1 Yes
0 No

39b. AMOUNT-If "yes", what amount per student teacher
40a. PREREQ-Does your institution require some type of graduate course dealing with "The Supervision of Student Teaching" prior to supervision?

1 Yes
0 No

40b. CRSEHRS-Approximately how many hours in the course?
41. PRCNTCO-Approximately what percent of your cooperating teachers have had a course in the supervision of student teachers?

0 None
1 1-5%
2 6-10%
3 11-25%
4 26-50%
5 51-75%
6 76-100%
7 Don't know

42. WHOEVAL2-Check those who participate in the evaluation of student teachers (YES=1, and NO=0)

☐ Director of Student Teaching
☐ College supervisor
☐ Principal of cooperating school
☐ Other, please state

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The findings of this descriptive research study were intended to contribute to the body of knowledge relating to the status of student teaching programs in the NCACS region. It is hoped that the data obtained will be of wide use to administrators and practitioners involved in teacher education. In addition, it is the researcher's desire that the information obtained will provide a broader understanding of current conditions and will provide a factual basis for future planning in teacher education.

The items in the study were asked from the following four main categories:

1. the general background of the institutions;
2. the administration of the student teaching program;
3. the student teachers themselves;
4. the cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers.

The summary presented in this section corresponds to the four categories of the questionnaire. All the conclusions are based on the data provided by the 162 responding institutions which represent 72 percent of the total population of teacher training institutions in the NCACS region.

Summary of the Findings

General Background of the Institutions

(Questions 1 to 6)

1. The majority of the responding institutions in the NCACS region are controlled by private organizations.
2. Of the reporting institutions, the highest number of undergraduate student enrollments were from 1,000 to 2,999 students.
3. There was some variation in the size of teacher preparation programs across the region; it ranged from 11 students to more than a 1,000 students at some of the larger institutions. The most often reported number of students admitted during the academic year of 1993-94 ranged between 201 to 992 students.
4. One hundred percent of the responding institutions in the region are accredited by the North Central Association.
5. Eighty-eight, or 56%, of the responding institutions were accredited by NCATE.
6. More than half, 60%, of the institutions admit their students in their teacher education programs near the end of their sophomore.

Administration and Supervision of the Student Teaching Programs

(Questions 7 to 22)

7. The title of the person in charge of the student teaching program was most often reported as the Head, Department of Education.
8. The most often reported number of years in the position of being in charge of the student teaching program was five to ten years.
9. Also half of the responding institutions have some form of additional help in administrating their student teaching program. Although many of the institutions did not provide secretaries for the

person in charge of the student teaching program, they felt the number of staff members working with the student teaching program was adequate.

10. The person in charge of student teaching actually devoted eleven to twenty-five percent of his time administering the student teaching program.

11. Few institutions had a campus laboratory school, only fifteen institutions indicated that they had a laboratory.

12. Student were placed in both private and public for student teaching purposes often.

13. The student teaching office has primary responsibility for assigning student teachers to schools.

14. Final decision as to whether a student teacher should pass or fail student teaching rest primary on the college supervisor.

15. In a 100% of the institutions the overall academic record is the major consideration in the requirements for admission to the teacher education/student teaching program.

16. The number of applicants denied admission to student teaching was small. The data indicated that one percent or less was denied admission.

17. A small percentage of the institutions acknowledged that they employ graduate students to supervise student teachers.

18. Six to 10 student teacher was the average number of student teachers assigned to full-time college supervisors (or the equivalent of a full-time college supervisor).

19. The number of visits made by a supervisor to a student teacher during a student teaching placement most often reported was once every two weeks.

20. The length of visits most often reported was 60 minutes per stay.

<u>The Student Teacher Themselves</u>

<u>(Questions 23 to 31)</u>

21. The most common form of grade used in assessing student teachers was a letter grade. Of the responding institutions nearly

50% of the institutions used a letter grade; the second form of assessing was the Pass/Fail form.

22. The primary people who participate in the evaluation of student teachers was the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher.

23. Nearly all the institutions indicated that they provided opportunities for student teaching in culturally diverse areas as much as their scope of range would permit.

24. It was very unusual for more than one student teacher to be placed in one classroom at a time.

25. Pre-student teaching experiences ranged from 20 hours to 850 hours.

26. A very small percent of student teachers were unsuccessful in their first student teaching assignments; those that were almost always given a second assignment after some form of counseling and remedation.

27. Inability to control students was the number one reason for student teacher difficulty at a vast majority of the institutions.

Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teacher
(Questions 32 to 41)

27. Nearly all of the institutions provide written contracts with school districts where they place student teachers.

28. The most common number of cooperating teachers used during the academic year of 1993/94 was from 51 to 100.

29. The study revealed that the institutions have adopted a variety of approaches to help prepare or train cooperating teacher for working with student teachers. In order of most common usage were: 1) workshops for cooperating teachers; 2) conducting small seminars with cooperating teachers; 3) offering a formal course in the supervision of student teachers for cooperating teachers; 4) mailing student teaching newsletters to cooperating teachers; 5) holding larger conferences on student teaching; 6) sending cooperating teachers to state conference; and so on.

30. The most important characteristics identified by the responding institutions that a cooperating teacher should possess

were (listed in order of importance): 1) willingness to work with student teachers; 2) knowledge of teaching methodology; 3) subject matter competency; 4) possession of a certificate for this type of work; and 5) having taken a course in Supervision of Student Teaching.

31. The most common benefit provided for cooperating teachers was library privileges at the institution.

Differences Found in the Four Groups in the Study

The tests, chi-squire and t test, found there to be some significance differences between the NCATE and non/NCATE and the Private and Public institutions in the region. Below is a list of those such differences; included also is the question number where significant differences occurred:

Question #7. What is the title of the person who is directly in charge of your total student teaching program? Difference among who was in charge of the student teaching program.

Question #9. Do you have other members of the institution's academic staff (as opposed to clerical) to assist you in the administration and organization of the student teaching programs? Differences among the numbers of people helping the person in charge.

Question#11. As the person in charge of student teaching, approximately what percent of your total time is actually devoted to administering the student teaching program (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching a class, other administrative duties, etc.)? Differences among the percent of time the person in charge devotes to administering the program.

Question#14. Who has primary responsibility for assigning student teachers to school? Difference in who has the primary responsibility for assigning student teachers.

Question#15. Who make the final decision as to whether a student teacher should pass or fail student teaching? Difference among the number of student teachers enrolled.

Question#18d. Please fill in the following showing the numbers of college supervisors that you have. Differences among the number of generalist teachers who are college supervisors.

Question#18e. Please fill in the following showing the numbers of college supervisors that you have. Difference among total number of college supervisors.

Question#23. How many student teachers did your institution have during the academic year 1993-94, not including the summer session? Difference among the number of student teachers enrolled.

Question#24. What type of grade do you use for student teaching? Difference among the types of grades given to student teachers.

Question#31. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.) according to frequency the following causes of student teacher difficulty at your institution. Difference among the weights of the ranks given to the inability to get along with a cooperating teacher.

Question#33. What was the approximate total number of cooperating teachers with whom you placed student teachers during the past school year (1993-94)? Differences among the total number of cooperating teacher.

Question#36. Check the statement which best describes your policy concerning payment to cooperating teachers and/or cooperating school systems for working with your student teachers. Differences among how cooperating teachers were paid.

Question#41. Approximately what percent of your cooperating teachers have had a course in the supervision of student teachers? Differences among percent of cooperating teachers that have had a course in supervision of student teaching.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the results of the study:

1. There were certain practices which occurred almost universally throughout the region of the 162 responding institutions. For example, nearly all of the institutions offered both elementary and secondary programs, all institutions require pre-student

teaching experiences, student teachers were never placed in the same classroom together, did not require a course in supervision for cooperating teachers, provided opportunities for student teaching in culturally diverse areas as much as their scope of range would allow.

2. There were certain practices which varied throughout the region. For example, various titles were given to the persons directly in charge of the student teaching program, the number of years the person in charge of the student teaching program had held the position a great deal, number of cooperating teachers used at each institution during the 1993-94 academic year, the number of college supervisors at each institution, and benefits provided to cooperating teacher varied, all institutions used both private and public school for the placement of student teachers.

3. There were some diversity among the student teaching programs in the region. The size of the student teaching program was major different at institutions. The number of the student teacher visits made by the college supervisor; although the most common was twice a week, there were some that visited on need base only.

4. Differences in the student teaching programs existed between the NCATE and non-NCATE institutions and Private and Public institutions.

5. Although, students who were unsuccessful at their first attempt at student teaching were rarely eliminated from the teacher education program, however, there were some institutions that did not allow students a second chance to be successful at student teaching if they were not at first.

6. Institutional size contributed to many of the differences found to exist between institutions in the region.

Recommendations

The person responding to the questionnaire was afforded the opportunity to make recommendations regarding student teaching programs in the region. The recommendations are divided into three areas: (a) Recommendations made by persons completing

questionnaire, (b) recommendations based on the findings of the study, and (c) recommendations for further research.

Recommendations from Subjects

Work very closely with cooperating teachers and select them very carefully.

Student teachers should portable computer; require classroom management; and complete a portfolio during student teaching.

Cooperating teachers should have training on how to with student teachers; payments to cooperating teachers should be more than $100; all education students should be tested by a Perceiver Test -"Do they have the necessary skills to be a teacher?"

There should be more effective ways to select cooperating teachers than letting the school system appoint them.

Provide student teachers more culturally diversified student teaching assignments.

Provide preservice practicums; require student teachers to develop a portfolio.

Programs should require/encourage students to engage in self-evaluation and refection processes; traditional models (teaching/ preparation) needs to be readjusted or changed to meet the needs of new students; student teachers needs to be better prepared for working with cohorts of professionals.

More clerical support for the university and more input in selection of cooperating teachers.

More training in clinical supervision for cooperating teachers.

More focus on training cooperating teachers.

That the university have a stronger net working for people in charge of the student teaching program.

Cooperating teachers must be treated as professors, they need some kind of recognition and university faculty status.

Offer some seminars during the student teaching cycle.

More involvement of faculty members of the K-12 programs.

Use cooperating teachers with experiences of working with student teachers.

More on-site provision for most appropriate experience for the student teachers.

Have a sizable stipend for cooperating teachers who take student teachers; What are sources for getting funds to pay cooperating teachers?

Require student teachers to have at least two different experiences.

Student teaching should be a semester long and have supervision from the university supervisor at least once per week.

Closer relationship with cooperating teachers; cooperating teacher should take at least one course supervision.

Earlier stressing to future student teachers the amount of necessary work involved in teaching.

Use student seminar as "reminders" of key areas--1) classroom management, 2) intervention strategies, methodology/strategies and as a support group; institutions need to "grow" their own cooperating teachers--investment of dollars and people resources; form a linkage with schools to make pre-student teaching and student teaching experience more successful.

Be sure to recognize cooperating teachers and principals for service performed.

Develop a status for cooperating teachers--Professional Practice Relationships.

Be willing to make changes based on feedback from teachers; develop a student peer group for student teachers.

Student teaching needs to be one full semester and classroom management course needs to be taken concurrently.

More students need to be failed and eliminated from the teaching program.

Secondary student teachers should have experiences in middle and high schools; elementary student teachers should have experiences in primary and intermediate.

Require cooperating teachers to have courses in supervision of teachers.

Recommendations as a Result of the Study

From the results of the, the following recommendations are offered:

1. The student teaching programs should strive to add new, innovative ideas to their programs.
2. The pre-student teaching experiences should be more consist.
3. Formal training programs for the supervision of student teachers should be required for cooperating teachers prior to student teacher supervision.
4. There should be a consistent plan of selection of cooperating teachers.
5. There should be a greater number of institutions accredited by NCATE.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of this study, the following are suggestions for further investigations in the area of student teaching:

1. There should be more research on the subject of student teaching and the preparation of teachers.
2. A study should be done to determine in what ways cooperating teachers feel student teaching programs can be improved.
3. A replication of this study is recommended in five to ten years to determine the changes that have occurred in the region.

It is evident that the findings of this study have provided a great deal of descriptive data about student teaching programs in the NCACS region. Such data may be of use to the following:

1. for those involved in policy development at all levels;
2. for those planning and implementaing student teaching programs;
3. for those interested in research about student teaching

References

Abrell, R. (1982). Clinical experiences in the 21st century. Clearing House, 55 (6), 284-86.

Archambault, R. (Ed.). (1964). John Dewey on education: Selected writings. New York: Random House.

Calhoun, S. E. (1986). Are our future teachers prepared for the stress that lies ahead? Clearing House, 60 (6), 178-79.

Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI.

Johnson, J. A., (1968). A national survey of student teaching programs. IL: Northern Illinois University.

McIntyre, D. J. (1983). Field experiences in teacher education from student to teacher. Washington, DC: Foundation for Excellence in Teacher Education and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

McIntyre, D. J., & Norris, W. R. (1980). Research on the student teachingtriad. Contemporary Education, 51 (4), 193-196.

National council for accreditation of teacher education (1987). NCATE standards, procedures, and policies for the accreditation of professional education units. Washington, D. C. : NCATE.

Paese, P. C. (1984). Student teaching supervision: Where we are and where we should be? Physical Educator, 41, 90-94.

Reitzammer, E. A. (1988). A descriptive and comparative study of state certified student teaching programs in Alabama's institutions of higher education. Dissertation Abstract International.

Renaissance Group. (1989). Teacher for the new world: A statement of principles. IA: University of Northern Iowa/Cedar Falls.

Roth, B. (1984-85, Winter). Alternative futures for teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 6, 1-5.

Schlecty, P.C. & Vance, V.S. (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. The Elementary School Journal, 83, 469-487.

Sykes, G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets.

Tom, A. R. (1987). How should teachers be educated?: An assessment of three reform reports. IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Yates, J. W. (1982). A national survey of student teaching programs 1981. Dissertation Abstract International, 43, 1041-A.

Yerg, B. J. (1982). A systems approach to student teaching. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 53, 69-71.